

### **REMARKS**

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated April 2, 2008. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

#### **Status of the Claims**

As outlined above, claims 9-18 stand for consideration in this application, wherein claims 1-8 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. In addition, new claims 11-18 are hereby submitted for consideration.

All amendments to the application are fully supported therein, including Fig. 1. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

#### **Prior Art Rejection**

##### **35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection**

Each of claims 1-10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,194,524). As mentioned above, claims 1-8 are being cancelled, and new claims 11-18 are being added.

According to the M.P.E.P. §2131, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a), (b), and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

#### **Claim 11**

A search system as recited in claim 1 comprises a search broker, a portal server, a group of services servers, a policy database, and a registry management server. Fig. 1 illustrates a block diagram of an exemplary system as recited in claim 11. The search broker searches for a service servers providing an element service, for selecting and carrying out an element service in a next stage organized in a hierarchical structure from a group of element service server for providing the element service. The search broker is connected to a client for requesting a composite service, but is not included in the portal server. The portal server serves as a portal of the composite service. The group of service servers provides more than

two element services organized in a hierarchical structure for providing a composite service. The policy database holds policy information about service contents requested by the client. The policy database is connected to the policy management server. The registry management server holds contents of element service provided by the service servers. The registry management server is connected with a registry database.

The search broker searches for a service server that provides an element service in accordance with the search request, and inquires policy information from policy management server. The policy management server extracts the policy information from the policy database and sends the extracted policy information to the search broker. The search broker inquires from the registry management server information regarding a service server that provides an element service in accordance with the search request, extracts from the registry database the information regarding a service server that provides an element service in accordance with the search request, and sends to the search broker the information regarding a service server that provides an element service in accordance with the search request.

The portal server receives a request of the composite service from client, requests the search broker to search for a service server matching with element service in a next stage structuring the composite service, obtains information about a service server matching with element service in the next stage structuring the requested composite service from the search broker, and requests the element service from the server.

The server which receives the service from the portal server requests a search for the server matching with the element service in the next stage structuring the requested element service to the search broker, obtains information about the service server matching with the requested element service from the search broker, requests the element service to the service server matching with the requested element service, and carries out a request for the element service in the next stage.

In contrast, Suzuki shows that an information processing system comprises an information disclosing server for disclosing contents, a portal server for obtaining information regarding contents from the information disclosing server and for integrating/disclosing the information as a portal site, and a client for accessing the portal server to utilize the portal site. The information disclosing server includes means for storing the contents and means for additional information indicating the respective attributes of contents and relations among the contents. (See col. 3, lines 46-67, Fig. 1)

In Suzuki's system, a database stores page information and the contents information and an agent collects the additional information from an Agent Adapter (AA) implemented on the information disclosing server. The agent and the database are implemented on the portal server. (See col. 6, lines 34-41, lines 58-60.) In contrast, as set forth above, the search broker recited in claim 11 is not included in the portal server, and thus, cannot read on the agent shown in Suzuki.

Furthermore, the portal server accesses the information disclosing server which was registered in advance. The agent in the portal server registers definition information regarding the AA in the information disclosing server, and then, the portal server registers an information collection policy for the agent. The agent obtains the additional information XML document stored in the AA on the basis of the information collection policy. (See col. 8, lines 46-48, col. 10, lines 24-63.) That is, in Suzuki, the portal server itself accesses the information disclosing server to obtain the additional information indicating the respective attributes of contents and relations among the contents. In contrast, as set forth above, the portal server recited in claim 11 requests the search broker to search for a service server matching with an element service in a next state structuring the composite service and obtains that information from the search broker. Thus, the portal server recited in claim 11 is clearly different from the portal server of Suzuki, and thus cannot read on the portal server of Suzuki.

Furthermore, Suzuki shows that the administrator of the portal server creates and registers the information collection policy. In contrast, as set forth above, in a system as recited in claim 11, the policy information about service contents requested by the client is held by a policy database, extracted by the policy management server and set to the search broker. The policy database and the policy management are not included in the portal server, as shown in Fig. 1.

As such, the system as recited in claim 11 is clearly different from that of Suzuki. In other words, Suzuki does not show every element recited in claim 11. Accordingly, claim 11 is not anticipated by Suzuki.

Claims 9, 13

Claims 9 and 13 have substantially the same features as those of claim 11. As such, the arguments set forth above are equally applicable here. Claim 11 being allowable, claims 9 and 13 must also be allowable.

Claims 10, 12, 14-18

As to dependent claims 10, 12 and 14-18, the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claims 1, 9, and 13 are equally applicable here. The corresponding base claim being allowable, claims 10, 12 and 14-18 must also be allowable.


Conclusion

In light of the above Amendments and Remarks, Applicants respectfully request early and favorable action with regard to the present application, and a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stanley P. Fisher  
Registration Number 24,344

  
Juan Carlos A. Marquez  
Registration Number 34,072

**REED SMITH LLP**  
3110 Fairview Park Drive  
Suite 1400  
Falls Church, Virginia 22042  
(703) 641-4200

**July 2, 2008**  
SPF/JCM/YOM